

Regular Meeting
March 9, 2004

- 1. Oral Communications.....2
- 2. Criteria and Process for Naming and Renaming City-Owned Land and Facilities—Revision of Current Policy 1-15.....2
- 3. Proposed New Recycling and Solid Waste Services12
- 4. Discussion for Future Meeting Schedules and Ag17
- ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.....17

Chairperson Kishimoto called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burch, Cordell, Kishimoto, Morton

1. Oral Communications

None.

2. Criteria and Process for Naming and Renaming City-Owned Land and Facilities—Revision of Current Policy 1-15

Open Space and Sciences Superintendent Gregg Betts said he looked at a number of other city's, county's, and district's naming policies. There were four objectives to a naming policy: 1) to ensure that parks, recreational areas, and facilities were easily identified and located; 2) to ensure that names designated for parks, recreational areas, and facilities were consistent with the values and character of the area or neighborhood served; 3) to encourage public participation in the naming, renaming, or dedication of parks, recreational areas, and facilities; and 4) to encourage the donation of lands, funds for lands acquisition for development by individuals and groups. The Council's direction to staff included five points: 1) include additional specific criteria for the naming of lands or facilities in honor of individuals; 2) include a role in the name recommendation process for the Parks and Recreation Commission, or other appropriate commissions; 3) provide a process for transmitting historical information on the facility to Council as part of the recommendation process; 4) determine criteria that should be used for naming or renaming land and facilities; and 5) provide an alternate method besides the naming of lands or facilities for honoring individuals who have made a significant contribution to the community. Most of Palo Alto's Parks were named for people. Most community centers were named for the school it used to be or more geographically in association with a neighborhood. Approximately one third of the policies had specific guidelines for renaming. In most cases, renaming facilities was discouraged if the park or facility were a regional facility. The City Manager currently had the authority to name subfacilities, such as the Pat Briggs Theatre at the Children's Theatre. The Park and Recreation Commission (PARC) minutes of February 24, 2004, included two motions as Attachment A to the staff report (CMR:169:04). Commissioner Hagan made a motion that suggested that the Council should ratify subfacility names approved by the City Manager. A second motion made by Chairman Keating was that under, "Renaming," there was no clause for exceptions to "In memoriam" naming as there was for renaming of general park facilities. The recommendation was that the wording be identical for

both naming and renaming and that there be an exception provided for naming "In memoriam" for individuals. Comments were made at the February 24, 2004, PARC meeting on the question of naming parks or facilities for businesses or organizations. Palo Alto did not have a history of naming facilities after businesses or organizations. The policy allowed for the naming of a subfacility within a park or facility. The minutes of the Palo Alto Historical Association (PAHA), included as Attachment D to the staff report (CMR:169:04), discussed differences of the words "suggestion" versus "recommended." The intent of having two different terms was to try to create a hierarchy in the process where the PAHA looked at a name for its historical context and appropriateness. PARC Commissioner Cribbs expressed concern by words such as "significant contribution" or "lasting contribution." The policies did not reflect a way clarify the words more definitively.

Michael Closson, Acterra, 354 Poe Street, referred to a letter he sent to the Council on February 17, 2004. Acterra strongly supported the naming of the Arastradero Preserve in honor of Enid Pearson. Initially, Acterra did not feel it had been consulted by the proponents and was shocked that the Preserve would be renamed. Acterra was now comfortable with the proposed name change of "Enid Pearson Arastradero Preserve."

Edie Keating, 3553 Alma Street, #5, said the PARC thought the draft procedures were sensible recommendations to use as guidelines for naming parks. Palo Alto would not have many parks to name in the future. Renaming the boulevard the "Ellen Fletcher Bicycle Boulevard" was appropriate. A change to the draft policy was suggested to allow renaming for people who were still alive.

Herb Borock, P.O. Box 632, said the item was referred to the Policy and Services (P&S) Committee from Council in conjunction with an agenda item regarding renaming the Arastradero Preserve for Enid Pearson. The P&S Committee had to make a decision about whether the Preserve could be named for Enid Pearson based upon recommendations. The policy should not be changed.

Karen Holman, 725 Homer Avenue, said staff did a good job researching what other communities did. Many communities named parks for people who were living. The true value was the test of time. A timely identification or accommodation was appropriate. "In memoriam" was not necessary. Renaming might cause confusion at first, but did not pose a problem on in the long term. There were many parks in communities that had nothing to do with a locale, but a park was a great way to identify and recognize someone who made significant contributions. The C.1. Policy in Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04) was good. The procedures did not indicate that PAHA would be notified when an item went to any particular commission meeting, at which PAHA should send a

representative to answer questions. Suggestions came from the public, and recommendations came from PAHA. PAHA was the historical record keeper. A written recommendation report from PAHA should go to any review board or commission.

Beth Bunnenberg, 2351 Ramona Street, preferred the word "recommend" in reference to PAHA's action. The name should be passed on to a board or commission as a recommendation to Council. The board or commission could decide to agree or disagree. In the past, the practice of PAHA was to sometimes pass more than one recommendation to Council.

Tom Wyman, 546 Washington Street, said standards should be the same for a person living or not living when making a determination to name a park after a person. A living person would enjoy the recognition. Wording was suggested under Policy Statement, Attachment A to the staff report (CMR:169:04), such as "The purpose of this policy is to assure the City-owned land and facilities are named for individuals who have made a significant contribution or performed some service, which is deemed to have been of major importance to the community."

Emily Renzel, 1056 Forest Avenue, said staff did a good job pulling together a lot of information. The wording, "major overriding contributions to the City and whose distinctions are as yet unrecognized," was a strong statement and an overarching goal of the policy. The new renaming policy incorporated three additional criteria, which she assumed were to be considered in the alternative. The policy should be explicit that the criteria were alternatives. The term "compelling circumstances" was used in the proposed policy. The wording "compelling reasons" or "extraordinary reasons" were recommended because circumstances were not usually used in the context of naming something. Accomplishments or civic contributions of a person should have served the test of time for 25, 30, or 40 years. It would be obvious after that period of time whether or not the contribution was meaningful. Item C.3. of Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04), "Names honoring individuals or families, other than those of historic association, will generally be in memoriam" should be deleted. Section 1 of Item E, Follow-up to Selection of Name, was confusing and needed rewording. Under Procedure for Renaming Existing Facilities or City-Owned Lands, a notation should be added that at least one of the criteria needed to be met.

Tom Jordan, 474 Churchill Avenue, said naming "in memoriam" was a bad idea. The idea of a test of time was good. Twenty-five years was suggested. The first sentence of the staff report (CMR:169:04), "The current City policy for naming City-owned lands and facilities does not address the process for renaming facilities

or parks," was incorrect. Palo Alto had 32 parks, of which 12 were renamed. Two were renamed for living people. The fact the parks were renamed showed there was a policy. The renaming of Arastradero Park for Enid Pearson should be grandfathered.

Betsy Allyn, 4186 Willmar Drive, said revision of the process for naming and renaming City-owned land and facilities was clearly a prospectus only for future use. Consideration of projects already under the review of previous policies and precedents should be based on their merits; otherwise, rules were changed midstream. In 1965, when the Council refused to listen to the citizens to protect parks from future developments, Enid Pearson had the courage and vision to step forward, do legal research, and write the Park Dedication Ordinance.

Joy Ogawa, Yale Street, said she looked at the naming objectives but felt it was too late to establish the objectives at the current time. Knowing the location of parks being discussed was useful. Concern was expressed in the case where a facility was named after a corporation and then the corporation changed its name.

Council Member Morton suggested the P&S Committee approve the policy and introduce a series of amendments to policy to be discussed.

MOTION: Council Member Morton moved, seconded by Cordell, to approve City Policy 1-15 for the naming and renaming of City-owned land and facilities with revisions, as noted By Consensus of the Committee.

Council Member Cordell suggested the Committee might discuss policy issues.

Council Member Morton said the main motion was the last adopted, but amendments would be made prior to the final vote. Referring to Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04), the word "recommending" should remain. The PAHA should recommend the names it felt were appropriate. Recommendations could be received from a number of different sources.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change sentence in second paragraph of Attachment A of the staff report, first page, to "The policy also establishes criteria which will guide the Historical Association in recommending names to the appropriate City Commission or Committee for review, as well as criteria for commissions to use in their recommendation of names to the Council for approval."

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change sentence in third paragraph of Attachment A of the staff report, first page, to "However, places within City-owned land or facilities, such as a room or patio within a building or a trail or

athletic field within a park, which do not require formal dedication by the City Council, may be named by the City Manger or his/her designee, subject to final confirmation by the Council on the Consent Calendar."

Council Member Cordell referred to a speaker's suggested language to strengthen the policy statement.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Add the wording, "The purpose of this policy is to ensure that city owned land and facilities when named for individuals, are persons who have made significant contributions or performed services which are deemed to have been of major importance to the community."

Council Member Morton suggested an additional phrase regarding naming of streets. The current wording implied that the naming of streets was not a way of honoring people.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Add the wording, "But the naming or renaming of a street may be considered an appropriate alternative means of honoring an individual."

Assistant to the City Manager Chris Mogensen said there was a separate policy for the naming of streets.

Council Member Morton said the amendment did not override the policy, but said "in the consideration of honoring." Staff was asked to check to see if there was a conflict in the original policy prior to going before the Council.

Council Member Morton said procedures for naming new facilities or city owned lands was clear.

Chairperson Kishimoto asked about notification and suggested adding "and method of notification." to Item 1.c.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change wording in Item 1.c. to "In some instances, it may be appropriate to actively solicit suggestions and, in those cases, the project manager should specify a time frame for submissions and method of notification."

Council Member Cordell noted the PAHA made recommendations but questioned the PAHA ranking of recommendations.

Council Member Morton said he intended that "ranked suggestions" would be replaced with "recommendations."

Council Member Cordell suggested when rankings went to the next level, which was the commissions, there was an implied message about what was important. Latitude needed to be given to commissions.

Council Member Kishimoto suggested giving weighted recommendations in order to give an indication of a strong feeling.

Council Member Morton said the word "recommendation" allowed ranking.

Council Member Cordell said she did not want to take away the Commission's ability to look at the recommendations.

Council Member Morton suggested adding as part of the commission's deliberative process that the commissions can originate suggested names or provide alternatives, as part of the recommendations.

Council Member Kishimoto suggested taking out the word "ranking" to state that PAHA "could provide recommendations."

Council Member Cordell concurred with removing "ranking."

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Add to section 2, page 2 of Attachment A to the staff report (CMR:169:04) "The Project Manager is responsible for conveying the name suggestion forms from the City Clerk to the Palo Alto Historical Association and presenting the recommendations from the Historical Association." Section 2.a. changed to read, "The Historical Association may also originate suggestions for names or provide suggestions for appropriate alternatives as part of their recommendation."

Council Member Cordell referred to the third page of Attachment A to the staff report (CMR:169:04), Paragraph c. and suggested deleting "...shall rank its choices" and change "submit the ranked list" to "submit the recommendations."

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change wording in Section C on third page of Attachment A to the staff report (CMR:169:04), "The Historical Association shall determine if the suggested names meet the criteria of appropriate significance, and shall submit the recommendations to the appropriate commission or committee together with the rationale for the suggestions. The response from the Historical Association shall acknowledge all the names that are submitted, but recommend only the names which it feels meet the criteria and warrant serious consideration."

Council Member Cordell referred to B,1. and said the word "rank" needed to be removed.

Council Member Morton suggested Criteria 1 on page 3 be changed to read, "The name should, if possible, have or preserve geographic, environmental, historic or landmark connotation of particular significance to the area in which the land or facility is located or for the City as a whole." For many people in Palo Alto names such as, Rinconada, Foothills, and Baylands had a long sense of identity.

Chairperson Kishimoto talked about "meeting the criteria," and noted there was a point made about whether 100 percent of the criteria were expected to be met or whether it meant most of the criteria.

Council Member Cordell disagreed with saying, "meet most of it." The criteria in renaming listed doing something or doing something else. The criteria had to be met.

Council Member Morton said the word "used" did not mean something was required.

Council Member Cordell said the word "shall" meant "must."

Chairperson Kishimoto referred to Item 3 on page 3 of Attachment A of the staff report (CMF:169:04) and suggested adding "in memoriam or 25 years or more after the events for which the person is being honored."

Vice Mayor Burch disagreed and did not want to restrict the name honoring to only the living or force it to be in memoriam.

Council Member Morton suggested removing "generally be in memoriam" and add "must be supported by compelling circumstances."

Council Member Cordell asked whether the Committee was clear with the wording "25 years."

Council Member Morton said compelling circumstances should include time, which was up to the Historical Commission.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Section 3 on page 3 of Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04) was changed to read, "Names honoring individuals or families, other than those of historical association, must be supported by compelling reasons."

Council Member Morton suggested the following change to Item 4 on page 3 of Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04): "In the event the City owned land or facility was formerly school property or had other ownership for which the name has community significance or community recognition, consideration may be given to preserving that name."

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change Item 4 on page 3 of Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04) to "In the event the City owned land or facility was formerly school property, or had other ownership for which the name has community significance or community recognition, consideration may be given to preserving that name."

Council Member Morton recommended a change to Item 1 under Council Action, "The recommendation received from the Historical Association and commission or committee shall be placed on the consent calendar of the Council agenda."

Council Member Cordell said the Council put items on the consent calendar, for example what the City Manager was naming. The naming of other more significant facilities should not follow the same route but should go to Council.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change to Item 1, under Council Action, in Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04), "The recommendation received from the Historical Association and commission or committee shall be forwarded to the Council for final approval."

Vice Mayor Burch said Item 3 would no longer apply.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Eliminate Item 3 under Council Action in Attachment A of the staff report (CMR:169:04).

Vice Mayor Burch asked for an explanation of Item 1 under Follow-up to Selection of Name.

Mr. Betts explained when a park was dedicated parkland, there should be a name with it. The exception for SOFA Park was for a public process to solicit names and to dedicate the park to comply with stipulations of the developer but to still provide more time for the naming process.

Council Member Cordell suggested the wording should be as Mr. Betts explained.

Mr. Betts responded the word "shall" could be changed to "should."

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change Item 1 under Follow-up to Selection of Name, "The above-described process for selecting an appropriate name should precede the preparation of a park dedication ordinance."

Vice Mayor Burch suggested Item 2, under Naming Places Within City-owned Land or Facilities, should be "put on consent for approval by Council."

Council Member Morton suggested changing the first paragraph, under Naming Places Within City-owned Land or Facilities, "In the case of places within City-owned land or facilities, where the policy does not require Council action."

Vice Mayor Burch said the policy required Council action, so the intent was changed.

Chairperson Kishimoto asked staff to rewrite the paragraph.

Council Member Morton suggested saying, "City policy is to respect the name of any existing park or recreation facility particularly one whose name has City or regional significance, unless there are extraordinary circumstances and no other new facility or portion of an existing park or facility can be so designated."

Council Member Cordell said the tenor of the paragraph had to do with changing something.

Council Member Morton suggested saying, "City policy is not to change."

Vice Mayor Burch said the policy was not to change unless there were compelling reasons to do so.

Chairperson Kishimoto suggested saying "to discourage the renaming."

Council Member Cordell said things were named and the idea was not to change names unless there were compelling reasons.

Vice Mayor Burch said the policy was to not change unless there were compelling reasons.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Change to the first paragraph under Procedure for Renaming Existing Facilities or City-Owned Lands: "City policy is not to change the name of any existing facilities or city-owned lands, particularly one whose name has City or regional significance unless there are compelling reasons to do so." And, "Further, the City will consider renaming to commemorate a person or persons only when the person or persons have made

major, overriding contributions to the City and whose distinctions are as yet unrecognized.”

Council Member Cordell referred to Item 1 under C, Responsibility of the Reviewing Commission or Committee, and removed “ranked list.”

Council Member Cordell recommended “name or names” in place of “name” in Items 1 and 2 under C, Responsibility of the Reviewing Commission or Committee.”

Council Member Morton suggested removing “in memoriam” under the second paragraph of Item D, Criteria.

Vice Mayor Burch referred to Item 1 under E, Council Action, and suggested the wording, “The recommendation received from the commission or committee shall be submitted for Council approval” and to delete Item 3.

MOTION: Council Member Morton moved, seconded by Cordell, that the Policy and Services Committee recommend the City Council accept the revised policy attached to CMR:169:04 with the changes as noted above. Also, direct staff to explore alternative methods, other than naming of facilities, for recognizing individuals who have made a significant contribution to the community.

MOTION PASSED 4-0.

Mr. Betts reported that Attachment B should conform to the policy.

Council Member Cordell asked about the request regarding renaming the Arastradero Preserve.

Mr. Betts explained the policy went to the Council on April 12, 2004. If approved, the process for Arastradero and SOFA Park would be taken to PAHA with the new policy. On June 22, 2004, the policy would go to the PARC for recommendations, and then back to Council on July 12, 2004.

Council Member Cordell questioned why the request for renaming Arastradero had to go through the whole process because it went to PAHA.

Mr. Betts said there were two timelines: one for Arastradero Preserve renaming and one for SOFA Park naming.

Mr. Mogensen said staff understood a decision would not be made until a policy was in effect. Staff thought it had to wait until Council approved the policy.

Vice Mayor Burch said PARC already made a recommendation. When the policy went to the Council, a Council Member could raise the issue to have the recommendation return to Council as soon as possible.

RECESS: 8:30 p.m. to 8:45 p.m.

3. Proposed New Recycling and Solid Waste Services

Director of Public Works Glenn Roberts said staff believed it was time to implement a single stream recycling program. The community had demonstrated success with the recycling program, and Palo Alto exceeded the State requirements. The argument for source separation was no longer important. The program would let staff move forward to take advantage of efficiencies, both for the consumer and City operations. The consumer was able to have a single container with wheels, which would improve the efficiency of operations for PASCO.

Deputy Director of Public Works Michael Jackson said there were four items for recommendation: 1) Implement a single stream recycling program; 2) Change the collection of yard trimmings to cart service; 3) Supply optional curbside cart service for garbage; and 4) Approve compressed natural gas as an alternative fuel for the collector's recycling collection vehicles.

Council Member Morton clarified Items 1 and 2 meant there were two carts: one cart for recycling and one cart for yard waste.

Mr. Jackson said there would be an insert for the 32 gallon cart that made it a 20 gallon container. There was no charge for the first cart.

Council Member Morton clarified residents gave up a garbage can and, in exchange, got a wheel cart.

Mr. Jackson explained there were three sizes of containers: 32 gallon, 64 gallon, and 96 gallon.

Vice Mayor Burch said there were three elements: consumer's point of view, operations point of view, and recycling of materials. His concern was with maximum recycling and post use of materials. People wanted something to dump everything into.

Mr. Roberts responded staff agreed with the third priority and should have stated it more explicitly in the report. Taking advantage of current technology and programs enabled staff to make the change to sort materials.

Mr. Jackson said labor costs were involved with sorting materials. PASCO had a seven-year replacement schedule for vehicles, whereas other communities had ten-year replacement schedules. Many vehicles were sold as scrap after their useful life. The single stream program was not dependent upon whether or not there was an Environmental Services Center (ESC) at the landfill.

Mr. Roberts said the program stood on its own merits and was viably independent. Staff believed there were additional benefits to be obtained, either by working with the cities of Mt. View and Sunnyvale and the SMART station, if they chose to go to single stream, or by the potential for the ESC project further enhancing the City's current operations.

Chairperson Kishimoto clarified the contract with the SMART station was until 2021.

Mr. Roberts said that was correct.

Chairperson Kishimoto said costs and benefits averaged out to a ten percent rate increase.

Mr. Jackson said, in considering the capital expense in the first year, the impact rate was nearly 11 percent. The ongoing costs in future fiscal years were approximately three percent.

Chairperson Kishimoto said she assumed residential use had a high compliance rate and asked about the compliance rate in terms of overall diversions.

Mr. Jackson said the amount was less than the residential sector. Staff anticipated an increase in business participation.

Chairperson Kishimoto asked about the possibility of tiering.

Mr. Jackson said the City did not charge separately for recycling but had a variable can rate. It would cost less if a smaller number of cans were used.

Mr. Roberts said staff believed there was incentive to reduce the tiered rate, which was combined for refuse and recycling. Proposing a separate rate structure for recycling was not recommended.

Council Member Morton suggested a system be designed whereby the sorting was done without deterioration in the pick up. A way to sort recycling during pick up should be looked at.

Bob Wenzlau, 1409 Dana Street, said he worked with others in 1977 to begin a recycling program. The mission when curbside recycling began was to look at a true economic model that reflected and internalized the external costs associated with the environment. The loss of open space at that time was not valued. The wisdom of the Council at that time was to allow an experiment with curbside recycling. The motivation for this was to try to create institutionalized environmental good behavior without creating an inordinate burden. The environmental footprint of the current recycling envelope was unclear. The staff report (CMR:165:04) lacked the emphasis on the environmental component.

Ellie Gioumousis, 992 Loma Verde, said energy was necessary for recycling, and a big, noisy facility was necessary to recycle. Other cities had two streams: one for glass and bottles and one for paper. A large facility that used more energy and created pollution was not supported.

Joy Ogawa, Yale Street, clarified the pilot program involved single-family residences. The experiences of single family residences to multiple residences could not be extrapolated. Recycling issues were a concern in the fourplex where she lived. Neighbors did not remove their recycling bins after recycling was picked up. There was no financial incentive to recycle if the City made it difficult.

Emily Renzel, 1056 Forest Avenue, was concerned that PASCO was ready to change over recycling trucks two years in a row, the SMART station currently only accepted split cans, and the alternative with the single stream was that recyclables were moved to Castroville or Oakland. The combined fiber plus cans and bottles resulted in a degraded material which reduced its value by approximately two thirds. A single can precluded, until further notice from the SMART station, the ability to use the SMART station, which was the combined regional facility currently used. The split can was suggested, as it was the most flexible for the future in terms of where the material could be delivered. The can that was selected would dictate the trucks bought over the next several years. Split cans allowed the City to use the SMART station.

Karen Holman, 725 Homer Avenue, said there were environmental and financial concerns. The more reusable recyclables were a good idea. Energy and costs were necessary to re-sort materials. Rates of garbage collections could be raised, and a lower rate for a smaller can was an incentive. Providing an incentive for businesses to reduce the amount of garbage and recyclables could be considered.

Monica Devincenzi, PASCO, 2000 Geng Road, said material was not degraded but labor costs were higher. Sorters were necessary to do more of the work. More issues were involved with a split cart than with a single stream. Contamination was as high or higher on a split cart. The single stream tended to be more user friendly as well as a cleaner program.

Council Member Cordell left the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Vice Mayor Burch asked whether there was an option to do nothing.

Mr. Jackson said that was an alternative. However, significant investment was necessary in order to replace the crates.

Vice Mayor Burch asked how many people used one or more 30 gallon cans.

Mr. Jackson said mini-cans represented approximately ten percent and one can service represented approximately 25 percent of the customers.

Vice Mayor Burch was concerned about large recycling bins.

MOTION: Council Member Morton moved approval of the single stream recycling program with a condition that the Council receive a report back confirming that the single stream recycling led to a greater amount of plastic recycled.

MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND

Vice Mayor Burch clarified a major investment in trucks was necessary.

Mr. Roberts said the City needed to make a major investment in trucks and a reinvestment in the containers.

MOTION: Council Member Kishimoto moved, seconded by Burch, to postpone the decision regarding implementing a single stream recycling program until an integrated decision regarding the Environmental Service Center and purchase of new trucks was made.

Mr. Roberts said there was a limited window of time to make a decision on the single stream or alternative method of recycling. Resources needed to be included in the budget for PASCO for the next year. This budget item went to the Council as an element of the Refuse Fund. The Environmental Services Center issue did not hinge on single stream versus split containers.

Vice Mayor Burch asked whether the possibility existed to offer single stream to some people and split to others.

Mr. Jackson said staff could continue with the pilot as it existed in five neighborhoods. The City had an obligation to order new vehicles in fiscal year 2004-05, which were scheduled to be delivered in October-November 2004.

Mr. Roberts asked for guidance as soon as possible regarding the new vehicles.

Vice Mayor Burch wanted more assurance that single stream recycling would be successful.

Mr. Jackson said the PASCO agreement provided for Monthly Recycling reports, which were not only processed at the Landfill Recycling Center but also included tonnages marketed by material type and revenues received from those materials at any other processing facility. Staff also conducted a "PASCO Performance Audit," which includes reviewing selected recycled materials and the markets used to ensure materials are recycled.

Russell Reiserer, PASCO employee, said at the current time, materials were marketed to Waste Management regionally. The materials at the SMART station were marketed.

Chairperson Kishimoto asked whether PASCO guaranteed the materials to the factory that did the actual recycling processing.

Monica Devincenzi said PASCO dealt directly with brokers and directly with markets. Letters were received from the markets or consultants that material sent to them would be recycled.

Chairperson Kishimoto clarified dual stream and single stream were virtually the same.

Mr. Reiserer said the difference was approximately one dollar per ton.

Alfredo Romo, PASCO, said Palo Alto and its residents needed to be commended for their recycling efforts.

Chairperson Kishimoto asked about the costs related to yard trimmings.

Mr. Jackson responded the capital expense for the first year was approximately \$943,000, with ongoing expenses of \$94,000 per year.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Morton moved, Burch seconded, to recommend that Council approve Items 2-4, as noted below, with Item No. 1. "Implement a single stream, recycling program," returning to Council with a split vote of 2-1 (Kishimoto voting "no".)

2. Change the collection of yard trimmings to cart service.
3. Supply optional curbside cart service for garbage.
4. Approve compressed natural gas as an alternative fuel for the collector's recycling collection vehicles.

MOTION PASSED 3-0, Cordell absent.

BY CONSENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE: Staff was directed to return with a status report on the cost of the Single Stream Recycling Program 18 months from the implementation, which will be July 1, 2005.

4. Discussion for Future Meeting Schedules and Agendas

Mr. Mogensen said the next meeting was Tuesday, April 13, 2004, regarding the Environmental Services Center. A special meeting might be held on March 30, 2004, to discuss the first Council meeting in January and the Construction and Demolition ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

NOTE: Sense minutes (synopsis) are prepared in accordance with Palo Alto Municipal Code Sections 2.04.180(a) and (b). The City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are made solely for the purpose of facilitating the preparation of the minutes of the meetings. City Council and Standing Committee meeting tapes are recycled 90 days from the date of the meeting. The tapes are available for members of the public to listen to during regular office hours.